



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/812,037 | 03/19/2001 | Ian E. Smith | D/A0458 | 9334 |

23910 7590 07/06/2004

FLIESLER MEYER, LLP
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER
SUITE 400
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

EXAMINER

GODDARD, BRIAN D

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2171

13

DATE MAILED: 07/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/812,037

Applicant(s)

SMITH ET AL.

Examiner

Brian Goddard

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-10,12-18 and 20-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-10,12-18 and 20-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to the Request for Continued Examination and Amendment C, filed 19 April 2004.
2. Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-18 and 20-29 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, 17 and 25 are independent claims. In Amendment C, claims 25-29 were added and claims 1, 9 and 17 were amended. This action is non-final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-18 and 20-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,101,506 to Ukai et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,238,106 to Rosati.

Referring to claim 1, Ukai discloses a system and method for organizing a plurality of objects as claimed. See Figures 1-10 and the corresponding portions of Ukai's specification for this disclosure (Refer also to Ukai's claims 1-5). In particular, Ukai teaches a method of organizing a plurality of objects [files], comprising the steps of:

receiving user selections of multiple objects [files: See Figures 8-10] from the plurality of objects [Also see column 2, lines 9-55];

creating [See Figures 8-10] a group [file-case: 'file group' or 'group of files'] from the multiple objects [Also see column 2, lines 9-55];

automatically determining the last selected object [most recently accessed/selected file] of the group, the last selected object being the object of the group that was selected by a user last [most recently];

designating [Step 1055 (See column 8, lines 11-29; column 2, line 21 – column 3, line 8; and column 23, lines 24-38)] the first selected object [any selected object may be designated, wherein 'any selected object' includes the first selected object (example: Hitachi Catalog Vol. 5)] as a representative [representative image (116) on file-case door (113)] of the group [example: Hitachi Catalog]; and

displaying [See Figures 1-2, 7 and 9] the representative of the group.

Ukai does not explicitly disclose the automatic determination of the first selected object and the designation thereof as the representative of the group. However, Ukai's system does automatically determine the last [latest] selected object [the file that was most recently selected/accessed by the user] and designate this object as the representative of the group. See column 2, line 56 et seq. for this disclosure. Thus, Ukai's system does take into account the order of selection in the designation of the representative object, providing suggestion for automatically determining the first selected object. Further, Ukai teaches that any of the selected objects could be designated as the representative of the group. This not only provides suggestion for modifying Ukai's representative selection in different manners as a matter of design choice, but also gives explicit disclosure for "designating the first selected object as a

Art Unit: 2171

representative of the group” because the ‘first selected object’ is a member of the set of ‘any of the selected objects’ which can be designated as the representative.

Rosati discloses a system and method similar to that of Ukai, wherein selected objects [operating parameter display objects for a motor system] are grouped and displayed by a representative. See Figures 8-9 and the corresponding portions of Rosati’s specification for this disclosure. Specifically, Rosati’s system automatically determines the first selected object of the group, the first selected object being the object of the group that was selected by a user first; and designates the first selected object as the first displayed representative of the group. See column 7, line 5 – column 8, line 29 of Rosati’s specification for this disclosure. Rosati’s motivation for designating the first selected object as the first displayed representative of the group is the likelihood that the object selected first by the user is the object that is most important or relevant to the user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Rosati’s automatic determination of the first selected object of the group into the system and method of Ukai, so as to automatically determine the first selected object and designate this object as the representative of the group. One would have been motivated to do so because of the suggestion provided by Ukai in using order of selection and allowing any object to be designated, and further because of Rosati’s suggestion that the object selected first is likely the most important or relevant to the user in terms of the entire group.

Referring to claim 2, the system and method of Ukai in view of Rosati as applied to claim 1 discloses the method as claimed. See Ukai's Background and Summary of the Invention sections, as well as Figures 1-4 and the corresponding portions of Ukai's specification for this disclosure. In the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim, Ukai (as modified by Rosati) teaches that "an object [a particular photograph (file) for example (See column 1, lines 36-46)] may be part of more than one group [may be in both a catalog and an album, or even in two different catalogs for example (See Figures 1-4)]" as claimed. In a more specific interpretation of the claim, Ukai (as modified by Rosati) teaches that "an object [Hitachi Catalog Vol. 3] may be part of [linked into (35)] more than one group [Hitachi Catalog and Hitachi Catalog 2]" as claimed. See Figure 4 and the corresponding portion of Ukai's specification for this disclosure. Regardless of which interpretation is taken, Ukai v. Rosati discloses the invention as claimed.

Referring to claim 4, the system and method of Ukai in view of Rosati discloses the method as claimed. See Figures 1-2, 7 & 9 and the corresponding portions of Ukai's specification for this disclosure. Ukai's (as modified by Rosati) step of displaying the representative of the group "further includes not displaying the other objects of the group [See Figures 1 & 2: only the representative image 116 is displayed for each group 112], and indicating [by file-case knob (114)] that the object being displayed is a representative of the group [See Figures 1 & 7]" as claimed.

Referring to claim 5, the system and method of Ukai in view of Rosati discloses the method as claimed. See Figure 10 and the corresponding portion of Ukai's specification for this disclosure. Ukai's (as modified by Rosati) method further includes

the steps of: “detecting [Step 1010] an additional object [newer version of a file]; and, adding [Steps 1015 – 1070 (remainder of method 1000)] the additional object to the group, responsive to the detecting step” as claimed.

Referring to claim 6, the system and method of Ukai in view of Rosati discloses the method as claimed. See Figures 1 & 7 and the corresponding portions of Ukai’s specification for this disclosure. In particular, Ukai (as modified by Rosati) teaches that “the objects of the group may be viewed [Figures 7B & 7C] by selecting the representative [Figure 7A]” as claimed.

Referring to claim 7, the system and method of Ukai in view of Rosati discloses the method exactly as claimed. See Figures 10, 15 & 17-18 and the corresponding portions of Ukai’s specification for this disclosure. Refer specifically to the final step of Ukai’s claim 1 where Ukai (as modified by Rosati) teaches that “the representative of the group may be changed [‘when the file group is updated, changing and displaying said representative image’]” as claimed.

Referring to claim 8, the system and method of Ukai in view of Rosati discloses the method as claimed. See Figures 20-21 and the corresponding portions of Ukai’s specification for this disclosure. In particular, Ukai (as modified by Rosati) teaches the method of claim 1, as above, “wherein the objects of the group will be treated as a single object [representative file (e.g. Hitachi Catalog Vol. 5)] such that when a search is performed on the plurality of objects [Search Range: All Files] the representative will be returned [See Figure 21] if any of the objects of the group meet a search parameter [e.g. File Name (including) Catalog]” as claimed.

Claim 9 is rejected on the same basis as claim 1 above. In particular, Ukai (as modified by Rosati) teaches “an article of manufacture [computer system of Fig. 1] including an information storage medium [Main Storage 50] wherein is stored information for programming a computer [Rack Managing Program 500] to perform a method of organizing a plurality of objects, the method comprising the steps of...[See claim 1 above]” as claimed.

Claim 10 is rejected on the same basis as claim 2 above, in light of the basis for claim 9. See the discussions regarding claims 2 and 9 above for the details of this disclosure.

Claims 12-14 are rejected on the same basis as claims 4-6 respectively, in light of the basis for claim 9 above. See the discussions regarding claims 4-6 and 9 above for the details of this disclosure.

Claim 15 is rejected on the same basis as claim 8 above, in light of the basis for claim 9. See the discussions regarding claims 8 and 9 above for the details of this disclosure.

Claim 16 is rejected on the same basis as claim 7 above, in light of the basis for claim 9. See the discussions regarding claims 7 and 9 above for the details of this disclosure.

Claim 17 is rejected on the same basis as claim 1 above. In particular, Ukai (as modified by Rosati) teaches “an apparatus [See Fig. 1] for organizing a plurality of objects, comprising:

a processor [CPU 10];

a display device [Display Unit 100] in communication with the processor; and,
a processor readable storage medium [Main Storage 50] in communication with the processor, containing process readable program code [Rack Managing Program 500] for programming the apparatus to perform...[See claim 1 above]" as claimed.

Claim 18 is rejected on the same basis as claim 2 above, in light of the basis for claim 17. See the discussions regarding claims 2 and 17 above for the details of this disclosure.

Claims 20-22 are rejected on the same basis as claims 4-6 respectively, in light of the basis for claim 17 above. See the discussions regarding claims 4-6 and 17 for the details of this disclosure.

Claim 23 is rejected on the same basis as claim 8 above, in light of the basis for claim 17. See the discussions regarding claims 8 and 17 above for the details of this disclosure.

Claim 24 is rejected on the same basis as claim 7 above, in light of the basis for claim 17. See the discussions regarding claims 7 and 17 above for the details of this disclosure.

Referring to claim 25, the system and method of Ukai in view of Rosati as applied to claim 1 above discloses the method of organizing a plurality of objects as claimed. See the discussion regarding claim 1 above, as well as Figures 2, 3 & 5-7 and the corresponding portions of Ukai's specification, for the details of this disclosure. Ukai (as modified by Rosati) teaches "a method of organizing a plurality of objects, comprising the steps of:

receiving...[See claim 1 above];
creating...[See claim 1 above];
automatically determining...[See claim 1 above];
designating...[See claim 1 above]; and
displaying the representative of the group [See claim 1 above], wherein the display [Ukai: See Figs. 2 & 7] of the representative [Ukai: 116 (e.g. Hitachi Catalog Vol. 5)] is such that it is expandable [Ukai: Steps 610-630 (also See transition from Fig. 7A to Fig. 7B or 7C) – expanded by clicking on the file case knob 114] to show all the members of the group [Ukai: 117 (See Figs. 7B & 7C)] or collapsible [Ukai: Step 640 (See Figs. 2 & 7A) – the file case 112 is 'closed'] to show only the representative [Ukai: 116 (See Fig. 7A)]" as claimed.

Referring to claim 26, the system and method of Ukai in view of Rosati as applied to claim 25 above discloses the method of organizing a plurality of objects as claimed. See the discussions regarding claims 1 & 25 above, as well as Figures 2, 3 & 5-7 and the corresponding portions of Ukai's specification, for the details of this disclosure. Ukai (as modified by Rosati) teaches the method of claim 25, as above, wherein in the collapsed display [Ukai: See Figs. 2 & 7A] an indication [Ukai: 114 (also See Step 620)] of the expandability is shown [Ukai: See Figs. 2 & 7A and Steps 610-620] as claimed.

Claims 27-29 are rejected on the same basis as claims 6-8 respectively, in light of the basis for claim 25. See the discussions regarding claims 1, 6-8 and 25 above for the details of this disclosure.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 19 April 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Referring to applicants' remarks on page 7 regarding the Section 103 rejection of independent claims 1, 9 and 17: Applicants argued that Ukai and Rosati, if combined, do not indicate the step of "designating the first selected object as a representative of the group and displaying the representative of the group" by rehashing arguments previously presented.

The examiner disagrees for substantially the same reasons as previously presented, and for the following additional reasons: Ukai clearly shows the designation of the 'last' selected object as a representative of the group and displaying the representative of the group as shown previously and repeated above. Ukai further shows that any of the selected objects forming a group can be designated as the representative of the group. Thus, whichever object should be designated representative out of the group of selected objects is nothing more than a matter of design choice. Furthermore, this disclosure is sufficient to **explicitly teach** the step of designating the first selected object as a representative of the group, because the first selected object is inherently a member of 'any of the selected objects forming the group' which can be designated as the representative. Therefore, Ukai explicitly teaches the claimed steps of "designating the first selected object as a representative of the group and displaying the representative of the group," contrary to applicants' assertions.

Rosati provides explicit functionality for automatically determining a first selected object of the group, the first selected object being the object of the group that was selected by a user first. Furthermore, Rosati shows that in selecting a plurality of objects, the object selected by a user first is likely considered the most important/pertinent/relevant object to that user, as compared to the other selected objects. Therefore, Rosati places that first selected object front-and-center to reflect this tendency. Given both references, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated by this disclosure in Rosati (as well as the suggestion provided by Ukai described above) to combine the references as shown previously and repeated above to obtain the invention as claimed. Finally, this combination would contain each and every claim limitation, contrary to applicants' assertions.

Referring to applicants' remarks on page 7 regarding new independent claim 25: Applicants argued that the cited references do not show a display that switches between a collapsed and an expanded view of the representative alone and with other group members.

The examiner disagrees for the following reasons: Ukai's (and therefore the combination's) display of the representative does explicitly switch between a collapsed and an expanded view of the representative alone and with other group members as claimed. This is clearly shown in Figures 5-7 (particularly Figure 7) of Ukai, described in more detail in the grounds of rejection above. Ukai's display of the representative defaults to a collapsed view of the representative alone (as shown in Figs. 2 & 7A), but

Art Unit: 2171

can be switched to an expanded view of the representative with other group members (as shown in Figs. 7B & 7C) by toggling on the 'file case knob' (114) and switched back to the collapsed view as well, through the methods of Figures 5-6.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 6,076,106 to Hamner et al., US 5,884,306 to Bliss et al. and US 5,784,061 to Moran et al. are each considered particularly pertinent to new claims 25-29.


6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Goddard whose telephone number is 703-305-7821. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9 AM - 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2171

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

bdg
25 June 2004



SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100